THE FISHERY CONUNDRUM

Our Speck of War With the Dominion.

Special Herald Commissioners on the Situation.

They Interview Canadian Statesmen, Gloucester Fishermen and Jack Tars.

FULL AND INTERESTING REPORTS.

The British Provincial Authorities Impeach President Grant.

They Are Astounded by His Message and Hint Tnat He Is Buncombizing.

They Know Their Rights and Must Maintain Them.

The Yankee Men of Bait and Hook for War.

"Every Canadian City Ought to be Blown to Kingdom Come by Nitro-Glycerine."

Indignation and Threats of the Gloucester Boys.

How They Talk of the Seizures of Their Vessels and Ill-Treatment of Their Crews.

What Will Come of the Whole Thing.

THE KANUCKIAN SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

municate my report of the results of the very inte resting mission confided to me of repairing to the seat of government of the Dominion at Ottawa and conferring with the statesmen of that government upon the subject of the complaints made against hem of unfriendly and injurious treatment of American interests in the matter of the fisheries and the navigation of the St. Lawrence. I have to acknowledge on behalf of the HERALD and myself a reception most courteous and friendly on the part of the gentlemen of the administration. They expressed greatest satisfaction that the leading journal of America should have specially commissioned agentieman to hear their statements and views upon the very important subjects in question, and thus offered them such a medium of reaching the American public with a full statement of all the facts of their case as could not be obtained in any other way. I have been favored with long and protracted interviews in these matters by the very dis-John Macdonald, as well as by Sir Francis Hincks. the Finance Minister; the Hon. S. L. Tilley, the ster of Customs; the Hon. S. F. Howe, Secretary of State for the Provinces, and especially the Hon. Peter Mitchell, the Minister of Marine and Pisheries, ose department is more particularly concerned with these matters. I have had the privilege of full and ample discussion with all these gentlemenand especially with the last-of the difficulty that has arisen, and I think it impossible to speak too highly of the energy and lucidity and fulness with on behalf of their government. Your space would not allow that I should particularize the conversations I held with each of these statesmen upon the fisheries and St. Law Much of the ground, moreover, was naturally gone over again with all of them. It will, therefore, be convenient that I should throw my report into the form of a dialogue between your issioner and the abstract individual whom I will call "the Dominion statesman." And your readers may be sure that what is here attributed to that individual is the accurate representation of the collective views and statements of the gentlemen whom I have specified, whose studies of these ques tions seemed to be equally comprehensive. The Minister of Marine and Pisherles, although in departmental charge of them, did not excel his colleagues in the fulness of his knowledge and studies of these important topics. And whatever view the American public may take of the matters which I have the honor to report I can at least testify that the action of the Dominion government has been taken by a group of official gentlemen whom, after long personal experience of statesmen and governments. I care with which they do their business of governing a great community. Indeed, I have never conversed with any statesmen who seemed so thoroughly masters and authorities in their work.

Your reporter opened his conference with an intimation that the HERALD, true to its system of tracking subjects to their very source, had de spatched me to hear what Canadian statesmen had rence, and especially of the charges of unfriending ness against American fishermen. To this question I had the following reply from my Canadian states-

DOMINION STATESMAN-Sir, we are glad, indeed, that you have come. We are disposed to go into the whole subject with you comprehensively and exhaustively. And at the outset we desire to say that we are simply overwhelmed with astonishment at the language used by the President of the United States concerning us and the charges made against us. We are absolutely free from all offence against the United States in every particular. We have been assailed absolutely without cause, fact or reason. We have neither done nor said anything which amounts to more than the defence of our property in just, kindly and legal ways. We have stretched no point in our favor or against the people of the States. On the contrary, we have stretched points against ourselves. If you hear our case fully you will be able, with your experience as a lawyer and politician, to test it. Scrutinize it to the utmost, sr. and with as adverse an eye as you please, but pray

and with as adverse an eye as you please, but pray study it bully.

Heral D COMMISSIONER—Sir, I have come here for the very purpose, and shall listen with the closest attention and, I assure you, in the most judicial temper to sit you have to say.

Dominion Statisman—Wen, I think it would be convenient to say in the first instance that it is not the case, as the Frestdent intimates in his Nessage, that we are applying any new measures of severity to American Eshermen in our waters. On the contrary, we have practically surrendered, though we theoretically maintain, a very important point, the headiand point, upon which we consider our rights inductable, and we now maintain and enforce only our exclusive fishery property—that is to say, three miles from shore, which is of course as much an exclusive property as a gold mine on the land itself. Perhaps it would be well to go a little more into detail. The whole question now rests upon the arrangements made by the treaty of 1818. Previous to that date and to the war of 1812, indeed at the moment of the concession of independence to the chat date and to the war of 1812, indeed at the moment of the concession of independence to the Childed States, that government had advanced a claim not tenable and not eventhally adhered to of this kind. They said that the fishing grounds of the British were conquered from the French by the common military operations of the English and the colonists, and therefore they had a sort of natural right to use

them even after severance from the British connection. Such a contention was hardly serious, it amounted to aclaim to keep the privileges of British subjects after fighting to get rid of the habilities of British subjects. An arrangement was made in 1783, by treaty, by which a certain imited right was given in British waters to American fishermen. It is not necessary to go further into that, because the war of 1812 destroyed that arrangement, according to the usual legal result of war, which annuls treatics. This question of the fisheries was not settled at the time of the peace which followed that war, but imgered on into the year 1818, when, as I have said, the treaty was made on which the whole question now stands. The brief effect of that treaty was this:—The American fishermen were placed, as to the right of taking fish, upon precisely the same footing as British subjects upon a portion of the Newfoundiand coast, on the shores of the Magdalen islands, and along pretty nearly the whole of the Labrador coast. They were given, also, the right to dry and sure fish on all the unsettled parts of the Newfoundiand and Labrador coasts as to which they were given the fishing righted they were uses them only after agree mentwith the settlers were the rights given to histories fishing and shore the rights given to instore fishing and shore were the rights given to instore fishing and shore were the rights given to instore fishing and shore were the rights given to instore fishing and shore were the rights given to instore fishing and shore of the proper of the proper enjoyed or claimed by the thabitant thereof to take, dry or cure fish in or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of his Britanine Majesty's dominions in America not with the above mentioned limits."

This renunciation was followed by a proviso that "the American of white he are also have a proviso has the rights given to instruct the condition of character would rease a for the proper exclusion of American dishermen from

Reciprocity treaty.
MINION STATESMAN—That question was only

the headlands, sir, in this stage of the affair, before the Reciprocity treaty.

Dominion States. You will observe, sir, that by the language of the treaty of 1818 the United States renounced all rights of fishing access, not merely within three mainte miles of the British coasts alone, but also of the British bays, creeks or harbors. We conceived and still conceive that under that renunciation our exclusive line was determined by a line draw from headland to headland of all bays of British coasts, and that American fishermen were not at liberty to approach for fish within three miles of such a line. We have the decisive authority of Daniel Webster himself that this construction is the right one. Under date of 6th July, 1852, the gree ta American statesman complains that this large concession was made in 1818 to England of drawing line from headland to headland; but he does not venture to question that it was made—complains, on the contrary, that it was made—complains, on the contrary, that it was made—complains, on the contrary, that it was made—flower, shortly before the Reciprocity treaty of 1854 the American government began to complain of this large measure of exclusion as regards such bodies of water as the Bays of Fundy and Chalcurs, and other large indentations of the British America coast. Now, sir, I wish at this stage of our statements to draw your especial attention to this point, because it bears with such force on the question of our friendliness. Since the abrogation of the Reciprocity treaty in 1806, although as to this point of the headlands we conceive our rights to be indisputable, we have renounced their enforcement in practice. We now in practice limit, the exclusion of American fishermen to three miles from the actual coast line only, allowing them free fishing within all bays and harbors up to the three mile limit. Here is a point of great importance to American fishermen in which we have quiletly, for the sake of good neighborhood and kind feeling, practically given up our rights under t

the United States. Indeed, that may be said to have been the very plum of the pudding in the Reciprocity treaty, and if the Americans had kept it in their own hands all the questions now raised would have slept for ever.

Hehald Commissioner—Then the stage of the affair after the repeal of the Reciprocity treaty is a new one allogether?

Dominion Statesman—Tes, sir; and we contend that our conduct as regards the fisheries since that date, so far from being chargeable with unfriendliness, has been conspicuously indulgent, neighborly and friendly to the United States. Indeed, we go the length of saying that we have done everything except give up the property in our coast line fisheries altogether; for we have been willing and have attempted to give them the right of the inshore fishing on the payment of an almost nominal license fee. The American fishermen paid it at first, but afterwards declined, and left us no recourse but the enforcement of our rights.

Herald Commissioner—Oblige me and state the course of these transactions since the repeal of the Reciprocity treaty.

The American ishermen paid it at first, but afterwards declined, and leit us no recourse but the enforcement of our rights.

Herald Commissioner—Oblige me and state the Course of these transactions since the repeal of the Reciprocity treaty.

Dominion Statesman—With pleasure, You will observe that from the moment when that treaty was knocked in the head we were remitted to the exact position we held under the Treaty of 1818. The British government desired that we should treat the matter, knowever, in a spirit of conciliation, and we have more than responded to that desire; we have, indeed, acted in the spirit of self-sacrifice. In the first place, as I have already intimated, we have practically given up the headiand point altogether, in spite of a case which we consider unassatiable in point of law, and which we used before 184 to enforce by repeated seizures and condemnations of American vessels. We now allow them to fish anywhere up to the three mile limit or the actual shore line. But even as to these innitis we were anxious on every ground to avoid complications and have the best relations with the Americans, and to this end we were willing virtually to share the flaherles with them. All that we asked was that American fishing vessels should pay a nominal tonnage license for the privilege of fishing anywhere, and we nixed this at so low a rate that it really amounted to no more than a sort of pepper corn rental acknowledgment of right. Here is the statement of the operations of the system:—in 1866 there were 534 licenses; in 1869 there were 231 licenses; in 1869 there were 184 licenses, line should the during this period. But during the whole of these four seasous not a single American vessel was detailed. During this period, But during the whole of these four seasous not a single American vessel was detailed. During this period also we indulged American fishermen with repeated warnings, and it was probably this while special our license during the work of the first pay of the first pay of the first pay of

it is being represented under a different light by bligh an official as the chief of the republic himself. If he proposes to bind together all sections of merican people in one common American sentient by such a course it seems to us, to say the hast of it, that he will not succeed.

HERALD COMMISSIONER—The President in his lessage intimates that your legislation of late has een both unfriendly and novel in enforcement of our fishing rights.

Herald Commissioner—The President in his Message intimates that your legislation of late has been both unfriendly and novel in enforcement of your fishing rights.

Boshnios Stitesman—The President is misinformed, and it is greatly to be wished that he would study these points for himself, or be sure of those whose studies he depends upon. Our legislation has been no more than a transcript of that older legislation on the subject, which, as I have said, was never complained of on the ground of right during the whole period between 1818 and 1854. Nor have we ever attempted to enforce our municipal legislation, except in the undoubted three-mile limit from the shore. But allow me to state what has happened. At the beginning of the year 1870 we notified to the American government that we felt ourselves obliged now strictly to enforce the rule of exclusion from the shore line of three miles; not, be it observed, from headlands. During the year 1870 we have enforced that exclusion. There have been a few seizures within the three mile limit, pray observe, for illegal fishing. There has not as yet been one seizure for trading. Now, sir, pray notice this part of the transaction. After our notice to the American government that we now meant to take this line it became the duty of the American Executive to warn these people. And they did their duty. Secretary Boutwell, Issued two circulars, dated May 16, 1870, and June 9, 1870. In these circulars he notifies to the preper American officials that the Canadian government are now about to enforce their rights under the treaties. No compolaint was made to us. Indeed no complaint could be; for we were about to stand on our rights after a long course of indulgence, and even then not on our strict rights according to old treaty construction, as I have more than once said. President Grant complains m his Message that now we give no fice. A merican fishermen know the law well enough, and when they break it they break it with their eyes very wide open indeed. Our notice and our war

from the benefits of the American register of shipping. Rec.ly, sir, we gave up everything for a sension in the hope of our getting something in return, we got nothing, and now we are abused by the President for simply re-entering into possession of our own.

HeralD Commissioner—Do I understand you that there is positively no foundation for the suggestion that your late legislation is novel;

Dominion Stateman—Distinctly. We have done nothing but adopt the provisions of the imperial act of 1819 and the old law of Nova Scotia. There is nothing new at al. Our late act, like the imperial act of 1819, has no clause giving twenty-four hours' notice to the trespassing fishermen. It was found that such a clause defeated the purpose of the law, so we have adopted the old act of 1819. But always remember that our legislation applies and our setzures are exclusively effected within the three mile limit which belongs to us. What the President means by suggessing that our legislation is novel we cannot at all understand.

HeralD Commissioner—The President also suggests that you are enforcing new profinitions with regard to the trading of fishing vessels.

Dominion Statesman—There is absolutely no foundation for this insinution. I have clearly explained to you that the treaties limit most carefully American fishing vessels in the sum of the propose, and also the reasons for such limitation. We cannot have them trading under the prefence of trading, for that would be to give up the fisheries; we cannot have them trading under the prefence of trading, for that would be to give up the fisheries; we cannot have them trading under the prefence of trading, for that would be to give up to the fisheries; we cannot have them trading under the prefence of trading, for that would be to give up to the fisheries; we cannot have them trading under prefence of trading, for that would be to give up to the fisheries; we cannot have them trading to such a fishing vessels may come in for shelter, for repairs, for wood and for water. Why, sir,

now do this—we must maintain the exclusion of fishing vessels from trade. We cannot maintain the fishing property without It. And this we will now certainly not surrender beyond what we have done without a just equivalent.

HERALD COMMISSIONER—You have certainly stated matter for much serious reflection.

Doninion Statesman—Now, sir, here is a point to which we should like to draw your attention; for it shows in what a spirit of anxious, considerate friendship we have dealt with the fishermen of the United States. Under the first article of the Treaty of 1818 United States entizens may take fish on the shores of the Magualen Islands, but cannot use the land for fishing operations. But we have year after year allowed them to land their boars and haul their senses and enjoy all facilities, like Canadians. This causes us no small damage and trouble, we assure you. They come in great numbers. They are a class of people who, to put it mildly, have a great deal of animal spirit. They damage British fishermen and threaten the safety of the peaceable inhabitants considerably. The Canadian government has had much trouble and expense in maintaining customs laws and mavigation and fishery laws among these people. We might simply excude them according to treaty law. But we let them come to the Magdalen Islands, and bear the extra expense and dangers. Is that unfriendly? Then again, by the treaty American fishermen may dry and cure fish on certain of the unsettled parts of the Labrador coast. After they have been settled, so provides the treaty, the American fishermen may dry and cure fish on certain of the unsettled parts of the Labrador coast subject to this right of American fishermen, for we have only permitted settlement of the labrador coast subject to this right of American fishermen, for we have only permitted settlement of the labrador coast subject to this right of American fishermen, for each arroy, the American fishermen of the ground as before. In fact we have not allowed to use the ground as before in fishing

one to American interests, both in the States and in Canada, and principally, we are firmly convinced, to the detriment of citizens of the United State; themselves.

Herald Commissioner—I think that the question of the fisherics is pretty well exhausted. What about the St. Lawrence navigation?

Domision Statesman—Well, sir, I suppose we must speak seriously about the utterances of the President of the United States; but in this particular it is really very difficult to do so. The President states that "a like unfriendly disposition has been manifested on the part of Canada in the maintenance of a claim of right to exclude the citizens of the United States from the havigation of that river." We can only say that we are quite without any knowledge of any facts to which this assertion refers, or of any to which it could refer. The citizens of the States use the river as freely as we do ourselves. But somehow or other—in our sicep perhaps—we have been doing a great injury to the people of the States about this. We should amazingly like to know what it is. The President says, with great solemnity, that "there are eight States with 17,000,000 people upon these waters discharging into it." It is a great fact, no doubt, sir; but it has nothing to do with the navigation of the States with really appear that the President says, with great solemnity, that the fresholm of the States with the say of the states with a great fact, no doubt, sir; but it has nothing to do with the navigation of the States with seally appear that the President of the United States and to forget the Falls of Niagara. But it would really appear that the President of the United States has altoge, her overlocked for the moment the fact that the natural water way from Lake Superior to the occan is considerably impeded by falls and rapids, some of those are reckoned among the physical wonders of the world. We must reckon it among the pollincal wonders of the world that an American statesman should leave them out of view. Why, sir, the water way of the

respect. As to friendliness, the less said by American statesmen on that subject the better. Just look at the contrast. American canal boats, in competition with our own, navigate our Ottawa and St.

respect. As to friendiness, the less shall by American estatesmen on that subject the better. Just look at the contrast. American canal boats, in competition with our own, navigate our Ottawa and St. Lawrence canals and rivers, and can go without breaking bulk to Whitenall or New York; but so soon as a British canal boat reaches the American frontier she is stopped, and is not permitted by the restrictive policy of American navigation laws to ge any jurcher. We cannot imagine what the Fresident means by talking about the Rhine and the Danube. The St. Lawrence navigation is a navigation by canals supplementing the river, and our canals are freely used. Really, sir, there is no more to be said on this head.

Herald Commissioner—How do you think all these things bear upon the great question of the unification of the Continent—upon the consummation of the "America for Americans" doctrine, which we have so much at heart in the States?

Domision Statesman—why, we do not believe that there is in the Dominion at present any party whatever that desires any organic or revolutionary change in that direction. And we are quite certain that the growth of such a party is impeled or indefinitely postponed by a policy towards as which we can only regard as one of punishing us or starving us into annexation. But really this is the most mistaken policy in the world, both morally and fiscality. We are not badiy off as it is; on the contrary, Canada and the Dominion never before were so fourishing. Our towards as bundant, our taxation molerate. We know nothing on this side the horder of Eric rings or unchaste courts of justice. American greatness attracts us, but the practical working of American institutions repols. And we do not like being threatened, and are very sure that neither Great Britain nor ourselves can be dragooned into separation of inside the horder of Eric rings or unchaste courts of justice. American greatness attracts us, but the practical working of the bounding system and exclude the vessels of the Dominion from

THE YANKEE SIDE OF THE OUESTION.

"Well, I guess you'll find out if you stay in town long." This was the emphatic reply I got when, upon en feit about the trouble the Dominion of Canada had been making them. I thus found out at the very start that I had anticipated rightly when I surmised that there might be a good deal of excitement here over the matter. I rememin Massachusetts and therefore knew that Gloucester, the great headquarters of American fisheries, was just the place for an industrious correspondent to visit in search of information bearing upon the present international difficulties.

THE TROUBLES WITH THE DOMINION OFFICIALS AND WHAT THE GLOUCESTER FISHERMEN THINK ABOUT

There is no doubt that the Dominion authorities have brought about these difficulties simply for the purpose of forcing our government into a the Reciprocity treaty which expired some years since. This is what the Gioucester fishermen think, and they assert that the Canadians and Bluenoses themselves do not conceal this fact. They treat our peaceful and unoffending fishermen as if they were outlaws of the most contemptible character, and deny them the simple rights and privileges due from one civilized nation to another. One old sait with whom I conversed said that if Congress did not take the matter in hand the fishermen would have to go armed and protect themselves. "We must do it." he said: "If are seven thousand fishermen and sattors right here in Gloucester, and I, for one, would be willing to

COMMENCE PRACY
upon al their harbors and commerce, and keep it up
until they learn how to behave. There are others could get crews for a dozen pirate steamers in a dozen days right here in this town. I tell you, sir, this is what it is coming to unless something is done and done very quickly too. You will find others besides the fishermen who will back us, and we count old Ben Butler among our best friends. If he don't fix things at Washington we are going to rig up a dozen or so Alabamas and commence busi-

I talked with another man-not a fisherman. "It won't come to any serious trouble," he said. "for I happen to know that GRANT AND SCHENCE ARE ALL RIGHT.

and when Congress meets proper legislation will follow, and then Schenck will get his instructions, and there will be a change of conduct very soon on the part of the Dominion government towards our Yankee fishermen. Grant is aroused, and has promised to fix the matter right off, and you can be old Ben won't let him alone till he does. And I further know," he added, with a significant wink, "that Schenck ain't going over to England to eat dinners, but to fix up this Alabama and fish business. Our boys have stood this thing as long as they are going to, and the government knows it." THE BEGINNING OF THE TROUBLES.

It was early last summer that the troubles began, and the fishermen, without offering resistance promptly reported the various outrages to the representatives of the American government. By change of boundary lines at that time the Canad an territory includes Mount Jolly and a portion of the shore to the east thereof, which, in the treaty of 1918 was described as the southern coast of Labrador. The Secretary of the Treasury holds that this change does not affect the rights of our fishermen under that treaty. The people of Ottawa hold the opposite opinion, and propose to maintain it with gunboats, as they are now doing and have done ever since last June. Now the grand question is, in Gloucester it is clear that there must be an ad justment of the difficulties one way or another before the fishermen start out for the coming

As I have already intimated, there is indignation and excitement prevalent everywhere in the vicinity, and it is no wonder. If one-half the reported outrages of the Canadian authorities upon grace to our government that they have passed so long unnoticed. I have conversed with those best qualified to know about these proceedings and with men of high character, and their reports of the con duct of the Dominion authorities are all unanimous to the point that unheard-of outrages have been committed. Most of the statements which I have gathered have been furnished under oath, and they may be relied upon as implicitly true.

THE SEIZURE OF THE WHITE FAWN—STATEMENT OF
CAPTAIN PRIEND, THE OWNER.

The seizure upon the schooner White Fawn was probably one of the most unwarranted committed upon the Gloucester fishermen by the Dominien officers. The aunouncement of her seizure has already been published, but as the circumstances and details have not yet been given, concluded to obtain them from Mr. Friend, her owner. The Fawn is a first class vessel of 64.49 tons burden and was built at Essex only a few months since for Mr. Friend & Co. The alleged offence was a violation of the Treaty of 1818 and the British fishing laws founded thereon. The vessel salled from

Gloucester on November 21, bound for the Western Banks, where alone her crew were to fish. After touching at Portland for ice, she sailed for Head Harbor. Campo Bello, for the purpose of obtaining batt. This bait was delivered on board the White Fawn the next day, November 25, being brought off in boats, the vessel then lying about five miles from Lubec. The crew of the vessel did not catch or attempt to catch any herring or other fish while lying there, but only went in to buy bait, as American vessels had been in the habit of doing. There is no Custom House in the place at which the vessel could enter.

The master of the vessel went on shore to put some letters in the post office, and when he returned found a British officer on board of his schooner, who represented himself as the second officer of the Camadian cutter Water Lilly. The captain of the Water Lilly and eight armed men afterwards came on board and asked the master what he was doing there. He replied that he had bought some bait, which the captain of the cutter said was contrary to law. When asked to show the law he declined doing so. He said he should have to take the vessel for buying bait. He then took the vessel, the master protesting, and, taking charge of her, dropped her down alongside the cutter. Ten of the crew were placed in an open boat and sent to Eastport, being ailowed to take only some clothes with them, and the Fawn was towed into St. John, N. R. As soon as the news arrived in Gloucester of the seizure, George Friend, Jr., the chief partner of the firm, left at once for St. John. Immediately upon his arrival he called upon Mr. Goodwin, the American Consul, and Mr. Goodwin directed him to consult with Mr. Trick, the Queen's Consul. "I asked him," Mr. Friend says, "on what charge the schooner was taken, and he replied for buying bait. He claimed that a vessel buying bait within three miles of the shore was, by that act, preparing to fish, and it was on this cnarge the vessel was tried. A prize crew was then in possession of the vessel

ing in shore."
"What do you think will be the result of the pro-

Western Banks, and had no intention or idea of fishing in shore."

"What do you think will be the result of the prosecution!"

"Really, I can't tell. I have, however, through General Butler, our Representative to Congress, asked the President to demand this vessel from the Dominion government, as by interpretation of the law and the treaty on this basis no American vessel is sale when they see fit to capture her. Mr. Tuck told me positively that no American vessel can buy provisions or supplies, other than wood and water, and that the purchasing of anything else is a violation of law and the fishing treaty."

AN OUTRAGE AT FIRATS COVE.

I have also learned the ampublished particulars of an outrage upon an American fleet at Firate Cove, N. S., which took place as long ago as July. Having put into the Cove harbor from necessity, the fleet was visited by the officer of a Dominion cruiser, who ordered every vesse off forthwith. Two of the vessels, Wildfire and Sargent S. Bay, both of this town, were aground and could not move. The official was very much exasperated at this, and, with a force of twenty-five men boarded the Wildfire and informed her master that he should fine him \$500. Upon reflection, however, he concluded that he had no authority to assess and collect a fine, and gave the vessel permission to remain in portuntil two o'clock in the atternoon. He afterwards boarded the other vessel and proceeded in a summary manner to unbend her saits but was led to desist by representations from leading clitzens of the place, and finally took his men off, muttering curses loud and deep upon American fishermen, and declaring that he would "make some of them sweat." Netther of these vessels was accused of violating any law or regulation of the Dominion.

A COUPLE OF VESSELS DRIVEN FROM HALIPAX DURING A GALE.

The feeling, it would seem, is so bitter against these unoffending fishermen that the Dominion officials would willfully hurry them all to watery graves. Only a few weeks since the schooners Ruth Groves and Mary

ward island by an armed crew of naval marines.

"They are a damned set of reprobates and ought to be exterminated," was the answer! got from a finanerman down on the wharf when I asked him what he thought of the interference with his business by the Dominion officials. "Yer are a correspondent of the New York Herald, are yer?" he continued, taking a fresh chew of pigtail. "Wal, now, yer jest come long with me ant it in put yer onto a feller who'll tell yer all bout the G-d d—d whelps." I thanked him and followed. He took me to an intelligent young tar, who said he was one of the crew of the Charles P. Thompsen, and in answer to inquiries he proceeded to give me an account of an adventure that vessel had at Prince Edward Island last September. His narrative, in brief, was as follows: ef, was as tollows:

brief, was as follows:—
"The schooner entered the harbor of Charlottetown, and the English sloop-of-war Valorous, in
command of Captain Hardinge, was in port at the
same time. The officers of the Valorous boarded the
schooner as soon as her anchor was down and
inquired what business she had in there. Edward
Cash, the master, replied that he wanted wood,
water and provisions. He was told that he could
take them and to clear out within twenty-four hours,
but that he could not sake any bait. The officers

cash, the master, replied that he wanted wood, water and provisions. He was told that he could take them and to clear out within twenty-four hours, but that he could not take any bait. The officers then placed an armed barge alongside the schooner and kept her there all night. One of the crew, who had been ashore, came on board in the schooner's boat and was hailed. Afterwards the barge's crew boarded the schooner and tried to take the men out of the lorecastle. The next morning the vessel was ordered to proceed to sea, and went below the harbor, but it was blowling so heavily that the master did not think it proper to go out. An armed boat was then sent down to drive the schooner out, calling her crew smugglers and threatening them with prosecution. Before leaving, however, the captain made a protest to the American Consul against such treatment, but that officer did nothing about it."

"Now, yer come with me to another feller I know and he'll tell yer about what a time they had with the schooner Lant down in that same damned Charlottetown."

I went with my enthusiastic and indignant friend, and very soon I heard the following story about the Lant:—

"We put into Charlottetown in Angust and cast anchor. An officer of the Valorous boarded the schooner and asked what we came in there for. The captain replied that he came in to get water, also to take some bait that was shipped down to him from Boston by steamer. The officer replied, 'You are not allowed to purchase any provisions here, and you shan't have your bait. I order you to leave this port in twenty-four hours.' Two of the schooner's crew were on shore and could not be found readily, and the Valorous sent an armed boat's crew to drive the vessel to sea, and she was obliged to leave the two men on shore. Captain Allen made application to the American Consul to ald him in getting his bait, but he replied that he would do nothing for him. Mr. J. C. Hall, an American merchant at Charlottetown, took care of the men lett behind when the vessel put out to sea, a

vessel put out to sea, and forwardea them by steam to Point Kuldare, North Pount, in four days from the time they were left, and they rejoined tacir vessel."

My friend, who had accompanied me, here broke in:—

"You must remember, mister, that none of these feliers tried to catch or buy a damned bit of bait. What they wanted was to take on board some that had been sent down from Boston, with freight all paid and no duties. There ain't no duty on bait down at Charlottetown, anyhow, and so they couldn't defraud their revenue. It was a great damage to the Law's voyage, as well as the Thompson's, and I wish they could be licked for it."

AN AMERICAN FLEET RUSTLED OUT OF FORT MULGRAVE, STRAIT OF CANSO.

A captain of another fishing vessel told me a harrowing story of an outrage indicted upon a fleet at Port Mulgrave, in the Strait of Canso, in July. The vessels, he said, had scarcely time to procure wood and water before Commander Scott, of the Dominion Navy, was after them, and some of the vessels were not allowed even time to get their supplies on board before they were driven to sea by the armed cutter. The crew of the cutter kept a sharp lookout to prevent any of the fishermen from purchasing anything in the shops in the neighborhood. Heretofore, he said, these shops had supplied the men with mittens, socks, and the like.

"Yes, of course they do, and so do the people generally, for they depend largely upon the trade of American fishermen while in port. Some of these vessels had men on board belonging in Port Mulgrave, and these men very naturally wished to purchase some provisions for their families to use during their absence; but the vessels were cleared out without giving them any time to settle their bills or arrange for the comferts of their homes while absent. I tell you what it is, such things were deduced hard. Darn it, they wouldn't let us buy an inch of rigging or anything else we needed."

"What do you think ought to be done?" I asked.

"What do you think ought to be done?" I saked.

"What do you thi

in charge of an armed guard pending the action of the courts in the matter. This action was dilatory courts in the matter. This action was dilator Mr. Friend and his crew, having a keen idea injustice of the authorities towards them, under

and Mr. Friend and his crew, having a keen idea of the injustice of the authorities towards them, undertook

A WAR AGAINST THE DOMINION NAYY

on their own book, or, in other words, set out to rescue their vessel by force. Mr. Friend and his sixteen men did the business one dark night, and the manner in which they accomplished it is best tool by one of the vanquished marmes who was guarding the vessel. His story, when the case came up in the Vice Admiratly Court, was as follows:—

About half-past eleven o'clock on Thursday night a boat with fifteen or sixteen men came alongside, asked how far they wore to reeward of Southport, and said they would come on board for a driak of water. The witness replied that they could not be allowed to come on deck. Then they rished on board. A man came up to Thomas and demanded his ride, which he dropped on being colared. One man, whom he did not know, threatened to blow out his brains if he refused; he gave no alarm; was ordered into the cabin, and went, and had a talk with Welsh there, who told the witness not to be afraid—he would be all right: Mr. Friend also said he would treat the guard well; witness recegnized all the traversers but Moar. In cross-examination he admitted that he was not very badly used; heard some one in the boat cry out.

"Hout Mr. Friend said not to do so; the guard was not shut dewn in the cabin, but could go on deck whenever they thought proper; Captain Grady told us we should have to show them things, and we did; helped them to get up the anchor; the captain said we would have to do it; witness won't say he was sorry that Mr. Friend was getting his vessel—told him if was a pity for any poor man to lose his property can't swear to seeing any firearms; saw with one of the men what he (Thomas) thought was pisted or revolver; he held the slack of the throat-halyard when they were fishing the anchor; they wanted the vessel and did not do us any harm.

The craw indicates of chariotetown, who were generally in sympathy with them. The Queen's causel also end

the government, and Mr. Friend will probably bid her in.

ANOTHER OUTRAGE AT PORT MULGRAVE.

"Hello there, cap'n," was the salutation I heard towards evening, while walking brisaly up Front street, in the direction of the hotel. Before turning I knew it was the jolly old fellow I had been indebted to during the aiteracon.

"An, how do you do again?" I observed.

"Now, here, Mr. Herald man, I want yer to go 'long with me agin and see Ned Gorman; he'll tell yer all 'bout that schooner A. I. Frankin that was seized by those damned fools down at Canso Stratt Votner day."

I went along and in due time was in the presence of a genuine salt, who, I was informed, was Ned Gorman.

"My friend, Mr. Whatdoyoucalthim, informs me, Mr. Gorman, that you know something about the seizure of the schooner Frankin down at Port Mulgrave the other day."

"Yes; I know all about it, for I was one of the crew. I have already told the particulars to Collector Babson, and he's going to send them along to Ben Butler. I tell you old Ben is a brick, and I'd just like to go down there privateering with him."

"Yes; old Ben is a brick," I said approvingly.

"Yes; old Ben is a brick," I said approvingly.

I'd just like to go down there privateering with him."

"Yes; old Ben is a brick," I said approvingly, "Now, how was it about this affair of the Franklin ?"

"Well, I will tell you just the saine as I told Mr. Bay of St. Lawrence to Gloucester. Having finished our fishing voyage we went in o Port Mulgrave, anchored in the harbor and then went ashored for some wood. We did not fish or attempt te fish in the harbor, or within three miles of the shore. The next morning Captain Torrey, of the Dominion cutter Ida E, boarded our vessel. He had, however, been on board previously and examined her to find evidence for violation or the ishery laws, but he found nothing to warrant her detention. This second time when he came he said ne had been informed that I had been fishing inside the limits the morning he boarded her before. The captain denied this, and asked Captain Torrey why he did not take the vessel when he boarded her the other morning. He said that he had no proof then, but he had got some since. He went on shore then and consulted with Mr. Wildes, a merchant of the place. He see med to be quite undecided what to do. He was not himself personally sware et any violation of law, but acted on hearsay evidence."

"What did he do finally?"

"Oh, he took the vessel and sent her to Halifax, where she is now bonded for \$2,800."

"What became of the crew !"

"The crew were put asnore at Port Mulgrave destitute. The American Consul said he could not help us because we were fishermen."

ANOTHER SPLURGE BY CAPTAIN TORREY AT PORT

Captain Nicholas Murphy, of the schooner Hiawatha, also of Gioucester, furnishes an interesting account of a narrow escape he had from selzure by this same energetic Captain Torrey, but the affair took place at Port Hood instead of Port Mulgrave. Captain Murphy said that the Grenada had been seized the same day he went into port. After he had anchored Captain Torrey came on board and a-sked to see the papers, which I snowed him. I asked him if I could buy provisions on shore, and he said "No; and if I catch you buying any you are liable to seizure." He also told me if I was allowed to buy provisions to last me home and attempted to list either inside or outside the limits I would violate the law and he would seize my vessel. He aliaded to the seizure of the Fr nklin, and said that he had seized that vessel on evidence given by a Nova Scotia fisherman, was complained of her for having meddled with him when he was catching mackerel. He also said that he he he had be to hat he had be that he had be that he had be that he had be also said that he had said that he had be the harbor harbor in the harbor

treaty made no mention of any right to stay twentyfour hours in port for shelter, adding that I was
violating the law by being there anyway.

"I got inder weigh as soon as possible and went
to sea. If I had remained, according to his interpretation of the law, he would have seized my vest.

AN INTERVIEW WITH THE COLLECTOR OF THE FORT

pretation of the law, he would have selzed my vestel.

All interview with the collector of the pursuit of information was Mr. Babson, the Collector of the port. Aside from the outraged shortmen themselves there is probably no other man in town who manifests so lively an interest in protecting their interests. He has examined personally into all the outrages committed upon the Gloucester fishermen, and much of the information which he has gainered is already in the hands of General Butter, who, it is understood will immediately bring the matter up upon the reassembling of Congress after the holidays. Mr. Babson was very glad, he said, of the opportunity to lay before the country, tarough the Herald, some of the facts connected with the outrages which the Canadian government had perpetrated upon our unoffending and industrious American fishermen.

"I think, Mr. Babson," I observed, in the way of approval of his views, "that when the unparalleted wrongs are made known that the people of this country, from one end to the other, will insist upon our government taking immediate action in the premises, and it is for the purpose of informing the American people of the unparadonable conduct of their Dominion neighbors that I have visited Gloucester in search of information."

"And I am heartily glad that the Herald takes such an interest in the matter," he again assured me; "for the spoliation of our inshermen and the des ruction of their business is, as you say, a subject that will ever awaken a just resentment in the minds of our people. The Canadian interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 is simply an excuse for piracy, and their acts will be denied, repudiated and avenged. Under the pressure of the war debt the United States has been obliged to tax its industries intermen."

"I suppose, then, I am to understand that you attitute this annoyance on the part of the bominion.

heavily, and we cannot afford to give to Canada our free markets to compete with our taxed abor, and because we do not do this we have war made upon our fishermen."

"I suppose, then, I am to understand that you attribute this annoyance on the part of the Dominion government to a desire to bring about a reciprocity treaty similar to the one formerly existing?"

"Yes; that is it exactly. The concessions made by the Treaty of 1818 were those applying to the fishing business as prosecuted at that time. Not until 1825 did American vessels go into the Bay of St. Lawrence for mackerel. The cod fishery had been carried on by small vessels on our own consts or by larger vessels on the Banss. Since 1825 the mackerel business has increased, until from 500 to 800 vessels now go annually into the Bay of St. Lawrence daying the summer months. Mackerel, being a migratory lish, must be followed to be caught."

"Where are they found in largest quantities?" I inquired.

"Around Prince Edward Island, along the shores of Nova Scotia and the Magdalen Islands, they swarm in the bays in numbers beyond computation. The annual catch does not seem to diminish their number, and the supply may be said to be absolutely inexhaustible. At the time of making the Treaty of 1818 this part of the fishing business was not considered, as mackerelling was the only business recognized as a fishing business, and upon which the United States paid a bounty to fishermen. Vessels engaged in mackerel fishing were not recognized under the interpretation of laws existing at that time, and therefore the commissioners never had mackerel fishery in view when they give up the tributed States paid a bounty to fishermen. Wessels engaged in mackerel fishing were not recognized under the interpretation of laws existing at that time, and therefore the commissioners never had mackerel fishery in view when they give up the tributed States of the share mackerel fishing bounty in July, 1865."

"These later troubles between the Dominion autherities and the fishermen com